

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Paris Deleon Bookert,)	Civil Action No.: 5:14-190-MGL
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER AND OPINION
)	
Willie Eagleton, and Brian Stirling,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff Paris Deleon Bookert, (“Plaintiff”), an inmate at the Evans Correctional Institution in Bennetsville, South Carolina, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges that he has been denied medical treatment, that he receives inadequate access to the law library and inadequate outdoor exercise, and that the Evans Correctional Institution grievance system works poorly. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief.

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South. On March 11, 2014, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this case be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (ECF No. 18.)

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *Id.* The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those

portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made.

Plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation. (ECF No. 18 at 7.) However, Plaintiff filed no objections and the time for doing so expired on March 28, 2014. In the absence objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed.R.Civ.P. 72 and advisory committee's note).

Here, because no objections have been filed, the Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations for clear error. Finding none, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that the Plaintiff's claims against Defendants are subject to summary dismissal. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is adopted and incorporated herein by reference and this action is DISMISSED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Mary G. Lewis
United States District Judge

Spartanburg, South Carolina
April 8, 2014